

9-6-2005

Grant proposal for a study on moral development of deaf children

Amber Marchut

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.rit.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Marchut, Amber, "Grant proposal for a study on moral development of deaf children" (2005). Thesis. Rochester Institute of Technology. Accessed from

This Master's Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Thesis/Dissertation Collections at RIT Scholar Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses by an authorized administrator of RIT Scholar Works. For more information, please contact ritscholarworks@rit.edu.

Grant Proposal for a Study on Moral Development of Deaf Children

MSSE Master's Project

Submitted to the Faculty
of the Master of Science Program in Secondary Education
of Students who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing

National Technical Institute for the Deaf
ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

By

Amber E. Marchut

Student signature

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Master of Science

Rochester, New York

____ (date)

Approved:

Project Advisor

Project Advisor

Project Advisor

MSSE Program Director

Grant Proposal for a Research Study on Moral Development of Deaf and Hearing Children

Abstract (Project Summary)

This proposal is a request for financial support to study the moral development of deaf and hearing children. The project has two foci; the first is on analyzing various existing biases in Kohlberg's moral development stage theory and research methodology; the second is on understanding better the impact of communication parent-child and culture on moral development on deaf and hearing children. Five different groups of children who will be interviewed and studied: deaf children of deaf parents fluent in American Sign Language (ASL), deaf children of hearing parents where at least one parent is a fluent signer, deaf children of hearing parents where no parent signs, hearing children of deaf parents fluent in ASL, and hearing children of hearing parents. The findings will allow educators, parents, psychologists, researchers, and counselors to increase awareness, sensitivity, and knowledge regarding the biases in Kohlberg's theory and the effects of communication and culture on the moral reasoning skills of deaf and hearing children.

The Need for the Project

In almost every psychology textbook is at least a mention of Lawrence Kohlberg's moral development stage theory, showing the impact of Kohlberg's theories on the understanding of moral development in the field of psychology. What is often *not* included is a discussion of multiple biases in his research methodology, data analysis, and findings. Like many other

researchers of his time, he initially studied only white males and developed his theory based on the findings of these studies before studying other groups. The norming of stages of development on white males was common practice in both psychology and medicine until a few decades ago; the rise of the Civil Rights and feminist movements in the 1960s, encouraged researchers to take a second look at their methodology to find previously overlooked biases. Fortunately, these original studies have been reexamined. Even today, however, there still are controversies about what is to be considered the norm and which results are acceptable to be established as norms. In Kohlberg's case, many scholars have examined his studies and found biases favoring white males. Despite the biases in his studies, Kohlberg's theory is nonetheless used to study the moral development of children from a variety of backgrounds.

Kohlberg's theories have been applied not only to racial minorities and different cultures, but also to deaf children (Arnold, 1993), who have been found to lag behind their hearing [white male] counterparts. This lag may be due to any number of factors, which we propose to investigate in this study. In particular, we hypothesize that linguistic difficulty of the materials and ease or difficulty of communication between deaf children and their families will contribute to perceived lags in the moral development of deaf children. What we propose that is different from previous studies is twofold: (a) we propose to translate Kohlberg's materials into ASL; and (b) we plan to investigate different groups of deaf children, along with hearing children of both deaf and hearing parents.

Background

Before proceeding to discuss the inherent biases in Kohlberg's studies, it is essential to discuss his theory a bit first. His theory was developed after Piaget established his cognitive development theory. Through observing and comparing Piaget's and Kohlberg's theories, one can find parallel relationships and similarities appear, showing Kohlberg applying Piaget's theory to his domain of moral development. Both theories posit stages that people go through in a certain sequence. Kohlberg's theory has three levels (Preconventional, Conventional, Postconventional) divided into 6 stages, with two stages for each level (Kohlberg, 1984).

The first stage, *the punishment and obedience orientation*, reflects an egoistical perspective from the cognitive development theory and an orientation towards physical consequence and unwavering obedience for authority. The second stage, *the instrumental relativist orientation*, emphasizes the concept of reciprocity and fairness. A person at this stage focuses more on his/her needs and will meet others' needs in order to meet his/her own needs (Kohlberg, 1984).

The third stage, *the interpersonal concordance of "good boy-nice girl" orientation*, shifts to conformity, and at this stage, pleasing and/or helping others are highly valued. Approval is earned through conformity and good behavior. The fourth stage, the *"law and order" orientation*, values the maintenance of a social institution through following fixed rules, showing respect for authority, and performing one's duties (Kohlberg, 1984).

The fifth stage, *the social-contract legalistic orientation*, is based on the principles underlying a legal system, namely the maintenance of social harmony, and general agreement among people. This stage differs from the previous stage in that it allows for flexibility in

adjusting the legal perspective to the personal perspective. The sixth stage, the *universal ethical principle orientation*, changes from an external focus to an internal one where moral values are based on self-chosen ethical principles. These principles include justice, human rights, and respect for human dignity (Kohlberg, 1984).

Kohlberg (1984) summarized the moral development sequence beautifully by saying, 'The most primitive form of reciprocity is that based on power and punishment, the reciprocity of obedience and freedom from punishment. Next (Stage 2) comes literal exchange. Then comes recognition (Stage 3) that familial and other positive social relations are systems of reciprocity based upon gratitude and the reciprocal maintenance of expectations by two social partners. At Stage 4, this develops into a notion of social order in which expectations are earned through work and conformity. At Stage 5, the notion of social order becomes a notion of flexible social contract or agreement between free and equal individuals, still a form of reciprocity (and equality). At Stage 6, moral principles are formulated as universal principles of reciprocal role-taking, for example, the Golden Rule or the categorical imperative, So act as you would act after considering how everyone should act if they were in the situation.' (Kohlberg, 1984, p.74)

The six stages as discussed briefly above were originally developed from a study Kohlberg did in Chicago area with 72 males aged 10, 13, and 16 along with a group of delinquent boys. The findings from this particular study with a moral development sequence started as developmental types and then changed to developmental stages after twenty-five years worth of studies in Turkey and Israel, which confirmed the sequence but not necessarily all the stages (Kohlberg, 1984).

In addition to the extensive research, Kohlberg's defended his theory by pointing out the strong parallels and correlations to Piaget's theories of cognitive development. It has been found (Kohlberg, 1984) that people at a given stage of cognitive development are within one corresponding stage of moral development. Also, none of the subjects studied was on a higher moral development stage than the cognitive development stage, meaning that a given stage of cognitive development is a necessary condition for proceeding to the corresponding stage of moral development (Kohlberg, 1984).

In criticizing Kohlberg's defense of his theory based on Piaget's cognitive development theory, researchers have also questioned Piaget's theory. For example, Bronfenbrenner (as cited in Kohlberg, 1984) stated that Piaget's theory is affected more by sex, class, and culture than by age (Kohlberg, 1984, pp. 41). There have also been some findings that youngsters are more cognitively developed at an earlier age than originally thought. Because of these findings, Kohlberg's theory, it may not really be the case that cognitive development and moral development parallel each other as closely as previously thought. New studies would need to be done to investigate these potential parallels

It is fascinating that Kohlberg's theories of his moral development theory have become generally accepted in the field of psychology even though his studies have been shown to be full of bias. He has been severely criticized and studied, and his research methodology has been tried and reused by various researchers, showing the impact he has on the field of psychology, sociology, and philosophy. Peters (as cited in Modgil & Modgil, 1985) warned that despite all the criticisms leveled against his work, "there is a grave danger that they [Kohlberg's findings] may become exalted into a general theory of moral development may be seen by some to have been fulfilled" (Modgil & Modgil, 1985, p.1).

Hearing white American middle class males as a group generally score highest on Kohlberg's scale of moral development (Baek, 2002), which would raise any recent psychologist's eyebrow in skepticism. As noted above, before 1960s, it was considered standard practice to study only white males and establish the findings as the norm. In this regard, racial and ethnic minorities and women were set up for failure; they, and also deaf people could never "measure up" to the norm.

Another type of cultural bias can be found in the language of the materials. Hypothetical dilemmas are used in Kohlberg's analysis of participants' moral developmental stages, and biases can be found in the dilemmas themselves or in the wording. For example, true hunter-gather societies do not have legal institutions or a governing bureaucratic system, making it difficult to correctly determine their moral stages since stages 4 and 5 include a legal institution. Dilemmas more common in Western culture may appear somewhat unusual to other cultures and may influence the participants' moral judgment. The lack of identification with the character in the dilemmas also may result in different moral judgment (Modgil & Modgil, 1985).

If one were to take a look at the wording of Kohlberg's interviews, one could easily see how some phrases could be misinterpreted especially by a person whose native language is not English. Kohlberg often used "duty" and "obligations" in the same phrase when asking a person a question. A person who is not a native of English language may not understand the differences between these two terms (Kohlberg, 1984).

As far as I can tell from the literature, it is not clear whether Kohlberg took the possible biasing influences into consideration when conducting his studies. He proceeded to establish a sequence of moral developmental stages based on participants' responses about hypothetical dilemmas without discussing any adjustment he made to reduce any inaccurate translation or

interpretation of the dilemmas. His results showed the supremacy of white males compared to any other group; this is not surprising since white males were the first group he studied (Modgil & Modgil, 1985).

The claim that Western white males are more advanced in their moral development may show biases on Kohlberg's part; this has been recognized by various scientists from different related fields. Peter Tomlinson (1985) joked,

“Before challenging that primacy as a general psychological truth, I ought perhaps to indicate that I have personally found Kohlberg's social distributive formalist to be useful in my own decision-making but then perhaps that has more to do with my being a Western male with a Roman-Catholic upbringing and a philosophical training” (Tomlinson, 1985, p.112).

Kohlberg's explanation for the higher moral development in middle class versus lower and working classes is that people from the working class are less participative in the society and hence are less aware and concerned about legal institution and its influence on moral values. Also, Kohlberg discussed in his book that people who participate more in the society and who take up more leadership roles are mostly likely to take the roles of others, resulting in stage 5 and 6 thinking more than stage 3 and 4 thinking which are more common (Kohlberg, 1984). One might argue with Kohlberg and point out that most legal institutions support the middle and upper classes, and that lower classes often feel disenfranchised by the system and therefore do not participate. One only needs to speak with lower class to find out their grudges against the legal institutions for not providing them with the needed services. Anyone who knows a bit about sociology will be familiar with the established class system supported by legal institutions

meaning that people of lower class are more likely to remain in the same class, reflecting the fruitless struggles people of lower class go through to climb the slippery ladder (Modgil & Modgil, 1985).

Kohlberg has insisted that higher stages are not more idealistic or better than the lower class, but he has implied that higher stages are more ideal than lower stages simply by the words he uses like “higher” and “lower”. Kohlberg himself claimed that from his studies people prefer to use the higher stage thinking in solving dilemmas, and because of this people in the Western culture are more complex. Kohlberg contradicts himself when he says moral development stage theory when applied to people shouldn’t be used to judge them and then make a judgment by saying that people from Western culture are more sophisticated and complex in the way they think (Kohlberg, 1984). In his book, he even said, “higher stage is a better stage ” thereby proving his personal judgment and his inclination to look down on minorities (Kohlberg, 1984, p.400).

Despite all the criticisms made by various researchers, Kohlberg believes his findings are accurate because according to him, people in Western culture are often more educated than many other countries, and this is precisely the reason many people are further along in moral development. Pre-literate and semi-literate societies have been found to be lagging in moral development since the two highest stages are absent in these societies, and the reason for this, Kohlberg has claimed, is that village life tends to be simpler with practically no resident with formal education. Education, it seems, facilitates metacognitive thinking and more reflection, which results in higher moral reasoning. One researcher recognizes this and claims that stages 5 and 6 could be an entirely different dimension and should not be placed in the sequence of moral development stages (Modgil & Modgil, 1985).

Further, Snarey (as cited in Kohlberg, 1984) did a systematic review of 43 studies, 7 of them longitudinal studies in 26 different countries in order to have a reasonable cross section of different cultures and their levels of development and urbanization. The results showed strong support for Kohlberg's theory except for bias found at the upper end of the stage sequences especially regarding "traditional fold" (preindustrial) societies and nonmiddle class settings (Kohlberg, 1984). Another longitudinal study with 60 participants showed 13% of them at stage 5, and they had some graduate education, reinforcing Western culture value of education. Not all participants with graduate education ended up at stage 5 though (Kohlberg, 1984).

As already discussed, Kohlberg has faced severe critiques of his work especially recently after the civil rights movement and the second wave of feminism with the recognition of each ethnic group with their own norms and standards. But one more critique hasn't been discussed, and that is gender-based biases. Gilligan (Gilligan, 1982) took on a feministic perspective and argued that Kohlberg was biased against the female population. Her own studies determined that there is a separate moral development trend for females as opposed to the male population. The female moral development trend leans to what is called emotive orientation. This orientation is composed of sensitivity, empathy, compassion, responsibility, and consideration towards others. These qualities are nearly absent in Kohlberg's moral development theory, which assumes more the concept of justice reasoning. In this way, Gilligan points out male-favoring bias in Kohlberg's studies especially with justice being considered a male virtue (Gilligan, 1982).

Kohlberg's responses to Gilligan consist of two parts. The first part is that Kohlberg agrees with her in that his moral development theory is more justice oriented and that his theory is based more on principles and logic. There is a moral domain, and Kohlberg has claimed that he focuses on the part of justice reasoning while Gilligan focuses on the other part of moral

domain: emotive reasoning. Kohlberg acknowledges Gilligan's argument by saying, "...we admit that the 'principle' of altruism, care, or responsible love has not been adequately represented in our work. This point has been made forcefully by Gilligan" (Kohlberg, 1984, p.227). Kohlberg agreed that his studies focused only on males, and he claimed that he did that to keep the study simpler (of course, studying only female would have been equally simple). He also said that females may be less developed in justice reasoning because females traditionally have been less involved in secondary institutions: education and work. Because of this, Kohlberg was inclined to agree that a part of his moral development theory may be flawed (Kohlberg, 1984).

Secondly, Kohlberg claims that justice reasoning comes from an emotional motive in that justice occurs when people role-play and take on the perspective of others. This is empathy and consideration for others, Kohlberg claims hence his moral development theory is not lacking in any regard. He discusses the Heinz dilemma (see appendix A) in supporting the interweaving of justice and emotive reasoning by saying that the care and the love Heinz had for his wife increased his sense of obligation and responsibility to preserve his wife's life (Kohlberg, 1984).

Also arguing against Gilligan, Tomlinson (Tomlinson, 1985) pointed out a few comments Kohlberg made [about Gilligan] which show personal opinions and biases favoring the values and belief system of his gender:

'We believe that what Gilligan calls an ethic of care, is, in and of itself, not well adapted to resolve justice problems; problems which require principles to resolve conflicting claims among persons, all of who in some sense should be cared about" and "special obligations of care presuppose but go beyond the general duties of justice, which are necessary but not sufficient for them' (Tomlinson 1985, p.114).

Kohlberg also did studies with females and claimed to have found only minimal sex differences. He said that out of 34 studies done with adolescents and youth for sex differences, only 9 findings reported sex differences. 9 out of 34 is approximately 25 percent, which can be considered significant (Kohlberg, 1984).

Research studies using Kohlberg's methodology have showed both agreement and disagreement. Kohlberg (Kohlberg 1984) conducted his own studies in response to other findings to investigate for himself if he agrees with these findings or not. Carol Gilligan as mentioned recently is an example. Other studies have shown that even though there are similarities in moral development among people from different backgrounds and with different characteristics, there are enough differences to question the generalized applicability of Kohlberg's theory (Modgil & Modgil, 1985).

Kohlberg said that his theory can be applied universally and across cultures. Many would disagree with him in this regard because cultures differ in their value systems and their priorities. Kohlberg claimed that there are underlying similarities in values across cultures. Also he argues that as one progresses through the stages, the moral values become more universalizable, meaning that moral values become more similar at higher stages than lower stages. Kohlberg used Nazism as an example where Nazis' actions are considered morally wrong in most countries and are even considered wrong for members of Nazi culture. One would argue that it is wrong to apply the values of one culture to another like Nazi culture, but according to Kohlberg's studies, he claimed that every culture he has studied, "used the same moral norms and elements in the same structural developmental sequence, a sequence that has the property of increasing universalizability" (Kohlberg, 1984, p.283).

Biases are often inherent in research studies and nearly are always impossible to eliminate completely, and nearly all researchers recognize this and take this into consideration when analyzing and interpreting their data. Most researchers are careful about applying their theory across cultures. Kohlberg differs in that he argues his theory is universalizable and can be applied across cultures. He argued that most countries are similar in their progress along the stages of his moral development theory with most countries being relatively slow behind the United States (Kohlberg, 1984). Likewise, residents of different countries vary in their speed in Piagetian cognitive developmental stages, reinforcing the acceptance of Kohlberg's moral development theory being applied globally. In addition to supporting the universalizability of his theory is his comment that both science and philosophy were formed by the Western culture but have been accepted universally. Only after developing his theory did he proceed to study different ethnic groups (Kohlberg, 1984).

In defense of his theory Kohlberg cites detailed and longitudinal studies. A twenty-year longitudinal study of 53 American males was conducted and showed "steady advancement in moral stages with no stage skipping and stage regression in only four percent and on the average a person was sixty-seven percent dominant at a stage with adjacent stage thinking." (Kohlberg, 1984, p.208). Note here who were being studied: white American males.

The validity of the findings of various research projects on moral development is now being questioned. Many findings now are being reanalyzed and redone using a different approach. Findings regarding deaf youngsters showed them to be either lagging or barely at the equivalent of the moral development stages of their hearing peers according to (Sam & Wright, 1988). These findings have been questioned and reanalyzed then refuted to various degrees by Arnold (1993), and Kusché and Greenberg (1983).

One quality in Kohlberg, Arnold, and Kusché and Greenberg's research that I want to analyze is the use of hearing youngsters as the norm. There is a tendency to use hearing youngsters as the scale of measurement that deaf youngsters are measured against, just as Kohlberg defined normal moral development based on studies of males only. This is reinforced by the perception of deaf youngsters as being inferior, and any findings with this type of bias will be biased in favor of hearing youngsters. If this is changed and there is a deaf norm, perceptions on the moral reasoning skills of deaf youngsters may differ.

Different experiences deaf and hearing youngsters have regarding communication, socialization, living conditions, and education need to be taken into consideration. This surely will have an impact on how they perceive the world, including what they base their moral values on be it punishment and obedience or self-chosen principles as Kohlberg discussed. With the establishment of a deaf norm regarding moral development, there will be less comparison of deaf youngsters to their hearing peers and as a result, improved self-esteem and better self-concept of deaf youngsters because they will no longer be compared to their hearing peers as the norm. Both hearing and deaf youngsters experience different hardships and struggles, causing them to perceive the world differently, and there is no reason for them to be compared to each other with one group being considered the norm.

Deaf youngsters often do not get access to the Deaf culture until a later point in their lives. By contrast, deaf children of Deaf parents are given immediate access to Deaf culture, and this means they become immersed in Deaf culture, which may differ from the majority hearing culture. When the values of the hearing culture are upheld as the norm, the values of Deaf culture become inferior and cause members to look at themselves as being inferior. Through this study, Deaf culture will be looked at as well as hearing culture to determine similarities and differences

between the two cultures' influences on hearing and deaf youngsters without either one being seen as superior or inferior.

I hope that the research study that I am planning to conduct will examine the biases against deaf youngsters and also analyze the subpopulations of the deaf population. People often do not realize or acknowledge while conducting their research studies that deaf people vary more among themselves than hearing people. This could be one of many reasons why studies with deaf population often differ in their findings. In this way, it could be shown that many previous studies with deaf populations were done inaccurately because differences among deaf participants were not recognized or taken into consideration. In my study, there will be three different groups of deaf youngsters and two different groups of hearing youngsters based on the quality of communication with their parents and cultural impact if there is any.

A second part of my study is to analyze the impact of parent-child communication on the child's moral reasoning skills: many studies with cognitive development and language development have shown how critical parent-child communication is for cognitive and language development (Wilbur, 2000). There have been insufficient studies on the impact of parent-child communication on the moral reasoning skills of deaf youngsters. If this aspect can be analyzed, better understanding and knowledge will be reached regarding deaf youngsters' moral development and what educators will need to do in order to facilitate moral development so that deaf youngsters will be able to make wise and reasonable decisions about moral dilemmas. Such results will enhance the dignity of Deaf persons.

The significance of the Project

Deaf children are often found to do better cognitively with strong parent-child communication via sign language; thus parent-child communication comes into play in developmental patterns (Gunilla, 1999). Through having controlled various parent-child quality of communication, we can determine the impact of communication on both cognitive and moral development. Deaf children of deaf parents and deaf children with hearing parents with fluent ASL skills often do better academically and socially (Wilbur, 2000).

For hearing youngsters of deaf parents, ASL will often be the hearing youngster's first language just as it will be for deaf youngsters of deaf parents. Deaf culture will be the first culture for both of these groups, so it would be interesting to compare their results to find any similarities or differences in their moral development as well as their academic success. Because Kohlberg is biased towards American culture, it would be interesting to see if there is any bias against Deaf culture, and through the use of both hearing youngsters of deaf parents and deaf youngsters of deaf parents, we will be able to discern any possible bias.

Hearing youngsters of hearing parents will not be used as the norm but rather as a control to ensure the results of Kohlberg's previous research match that of the research being done in this study. If differences are found then this will need to be analyzed to find an explanation for the differences. The hearing youngsters also will be looked at to find similarities or differences. Through comparisons, we will be able to determine the progress of moral development of all five different groups and to see how they compare to each other, and we can answer more questions with higher reliability and validity. Because moral development progresses over time, the

youngsters have to be analyzed over time in order to map a chronological moral and cognitive development for each youngster.

Also as a part of my study is to have the English version of Kohlberg's interview translated into ASL so that there will be less bias regarding language and communication difficulties. Participants communicating in their native language will enable them to express their feelings and thoughts more comfortably and freely. Hopefully by having native ASL users communicate in ASL, more accurate results will be revealed and will show overlooked bias.

My hopes in having my grant proposal approved and being followed through is to discourage paternalistic perspectives of deaf youngsters thus perceiving them more accurately, reducing negative bias and destructive behavioral patterns on the part of both the seeing and the seen. Through a more accurate perspective, deaf youngsters' needs will be better met. People have a tendency to lump deaf youngsters together without taking into consideration their background differences, which often differ to a higher degree than the background differences of hearing youngsters. The lumping often results in skewed results, and hopefully my research project when approved will reduce the skewed ness and give more valid and reliable results, which then can be applied to deaf education.

Education for deaf youngsters today is poor and needs to be improved. One component of the education system that needs to be improved is the perception of deaf youngsters as needing to measure up to their hearing counterparts. By perceiving deaf youngsters as having their own growth, intelligence, lives, perceptions, points of view, and development reinforced by research findings educators can begin to adjust their own perceptive of deaf youngsters so that deaf youngsters are recognized for who they are rather than as handicapped because they lack a sense that hearing youngsters have. If deaf youngsters actually have their own scale of measurement

just as Gilligan recognized, acknowledged, and discussed in depth for females, educators of deaf youngsters then can understand their students better and work with them more efficiently.

The findings will have an impact on the quality of education and on the importance of parent-child communication in that with a better and more in-depth understanding of how similarly and differently deaf and hearing children develop, we can improve the education system and emphasize the impact of the quality of parent-child communication on children. With less bias favoring hearing youngsters, we can then perceive deaf youngsters as individuals with their own scale of measurement in development just like Gilligan who developed a different scale of measurement for female moral development thus disputing the old fashioned superior status of males. Each minority deserves their own status, apart from the majority.

Project design

This study is primarily composed of qualitative interviews with five groups of deaf and hearing children at biyearly intervals starting in 8th grade and ending in 12th grade which means that each participant if possible will be interviewed three times. There are 9 different hypothetical dilemmas with several of them being similar so not all 9 dilemmas will be used in one interview. Rather, three dilemmas will be used for each interview so that each set of interviews will have different dilemmas. The original English version of the nine hypothetical dilemmas along with questions can be found in appendix A, and the ASL version can be found in appendix B. The coding system written ASL version was derived from Baker-Shenk and Cokely (1980) along with self-created codes.

The 9 dilemmas and questions come from the questionnaire that Kohlberg used in his studies. They have been translated into ASL for participants native in ASL. The purpose of the translation is to provide the interview in the native languages of all participants whether they are deaf or hearing. As much of Kohlberg's research methodology as possible will be followed in order to better highlight biases in his research methodology.

Five different groups of hearing and deaf participants will be interviewed based on two variables: parent-child communication and culture. Deaf children of deaf parents fluent in ASL, deaf children of hearing parents where at least one parent is fluent in ASL, deaf children of hearing parents where no one is familiar with ASL, hearing children of deaf parents fluent in ASL, and hearing children of hearing parents not familiar with ASL are the five separate groups that will be questioned using Kohlberg's nine hypothetical dilemmas and his questions.

There are two versions of the interview: the original English version and the ASL version. There will be an interviewer for each interview, each using the version that is their native language, meaning that a native user of ASL will be the interviewer for the ASL version. There is already a written ASL version that can be modified to accommodate the interviewer's style. Each interviewer will be trained in Kohlberg's research methodology and in the understanding of the psychology, sociology, and philosophy behind parent and child communication and culture affecting hearing and deaf children.

Their responses will be analyzed and charted according to Kohlberg's moral development stages. All of them will be compared to their own group and with other groups to determine similarities and differences in order to analyze the effects of the two variables. The two main variables, cultural impacts and parent-child communication impacts, will be looked at and used to identify biases that favor hearing or deaf participants. But the prediction is that the biases will

favor hearing participants. Also, different moral developmental trends will be looked at if any are found. As mentioned earlier, norms based on hearing people have been used with deaf participants so a part of the analysis is to see any deviation from the established norm as a neutral difference rather than as an inferior difference. I hope that the findings will be significant for more studies to be done in this area.

Project Evaluation

As a part of the study will be a pilot study where there will be a run through of the interviews to smooth out any bumps. Modifications made for the ASL translation and for the communication with the English version will be looked at to ensure that there are no biases and influences in the interview procedure. The results of hearing participants will be compared to other studies used with hearing participants as well as for deaf participants to determine similarities and differences. If there are differences, reasons will be explored, such as differences in the conduct of the studies or possible biases or influence of either study.

During the pilot study, with participants preferring the English version, either two laptops with instant messaging will be used with both the interviewer and the participant present in person or the use of videorelay will be used with the operator acting in the role of an interpreter, and both the interviewer and the participant will be in each other's presence. The advantage of both methods is that they are cost effective, and both can communicate in person with each other regardless of the hearing status of either party. Another option that can be used is writing back and forth. The goal is for the participant to feel as comfortable as possible during the interview.

All the responses will be recorded via a laptop or on of paper if writing back and forth is preferred by the participant. As for participants who prefer the ASL version, the dilemmas and questions will be expressed in ASL by the interviewer and responses will be recorded via a laptop computer.

As mentioned earlier, the results of participants' responses will be analyzed for similarities and differences regarding communication between parent and child and culture. It is predicted that there will be similarities regarding culture between deaf children of deaf adults and hearing children of deaf adults while differences will be found between deaf children of deaf adults and deaf children of hearing parents who do not know ASL regarding parent and child communication. Those types of similarities and differences are the heart of the study in order to explore biases of Kohlberg's research methodology and to understand better the moral development of hearing and deaf children.

Management Plans

Each interviewer will be trained intensively in the use of Kohlberg's research methodology and analysis of participants' responses. As there will be an interviewer for each version of the interview procedure, there will be two scorers for each version totaling to 6 staff for the interview. As the interview will be more open-ended, participants' responses will be recorded down on a laptop and looked at further by the two scores as well as the interviewer.

Through the pilot study, the results and the information each interview puts down, and how they analyze results will be compared in order to increase similarities. It is essential that all

interviewers go into the interviews with the same mind-set so that no findings will be skewed due to different perspectives on the part of the interviewers.

The interviews will be conducted in a school environment in a small office where students may feel comfortable. The environment and atmosphere will be the same for each participant each time they are interviewed so no external influences may occur. A counselor or someone close to the participant will be close by so in case there is anxiety or discomfort, they can be called on and the interview will be terminated as needed. Hopefully the interviews will be conducted right after school so that no student will suffer for missing school, and they can still be in a school environment.

Each interview will consist of three hypothetical dilemmas with questions, which should take an hour at most. Most interviews will be conducted within the same month and analysis will be done immediately when the memories are fresh. We are proposing a longitudinal study; data will be gathered for a month every two-year. At the end of the longitudinal study, results will be analyzed further among the staff partaking in this study.

Budget

This study is very cost effective in that not a lot of equipment is needed other than laptops for the interviewers. The biggest part of the budget will probably be for researchers' salaries. Motivators might be needed for the participants to be active and motivated in their responses to the questions asked of them.

Equipment	Laptops with needed software programs and storing devices (compact discs) for interviewers	\$2,000
Personnel	Amber E. Marchut Interviewers Scorers Counselor	
Supplies		
Subject fees	Motivators for participants	\$2,500
	Motivators for parents/legal guardians	\$2,500
Travel	Mileage for interviewers	\$300
	Mileage for scorers	\$600
	Mileage for counselor	\$150

Budget justifications

Laptops will be beneficial in that the interviews can be conducted anywhere and analyzed anywhere. Typing is often quicker than writing notes and is easier to do without breaking eye contact or stopping the interview itself frequently. The only programs needed are Microsoft Word and Microsoft Excel.

The personnel will consist of Amber E. Marchut, two interviewers, four scorers, and a counselor who can be available for a few months per year for 6 years. The study will be conducted at the same school or school district as much as possible to minimize other influential factors. A counselor will be available as needed in order to relieve any anxiety or any other undesired effects of the interviews in the case any participant is affected by the interviews. Reimbursement for mileage will be offered for personnel in traveling to see participants, their parents/legal guardians, and school personnel, and to report results.

The interviews are intensive and require time and concentration on the part of the participants, and in order to elucidate well thought-out responses, motivators might be needed. Toys, books, food, gift certificates, and/or school supplies will be offered as needed. For parents, school supplies for their children will be offered to obtain parental support for the interviews.

References:

- Arnold, P. (1993). The sociomoral reasoning and behavioral of deaf children. *Journal of Moral Education*, 22, 157-167.
- Baek, H. (2002). A comparative study of moral development of Korean and British children. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31, 373-391
- Baker-Shenk, C., & Cokely, D. (1980). *American Sign Language: A teacher's resource text on grammar and culture*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, MASS.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The psychology of moral development: the nature and validity of moral stages*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Kusché, C. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (1983). Evaluative understanding and role-taking ability: A comparison of deaf and hearing children. *Child Development*, 54, 141-147.
- Modgil, S., & Modgil, C. (1985). *Lawrence Kohlberg: Consensus and controversy*. Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press, Taylor and Francis, Inc.
- Porter, N., & Taylor, N. (1972). *How to assess the moral reasoning of students: A teachers' guide to the use of Lawrence Kohlberg's stage-developmental Method*. Toronto, Ontario: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Preisler, G. (1999). The development of communication and language in deaf and severely hard of hearing children: Implications for the future. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, 49, S39-S43.

- Sam, A., & Wright, I. (1988). The structure of moral reasoning in hearing-impaired students. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 133, 264-269.
- Tomlinson, P. (1985). Kohlberg's Moral Psychology: Any advance on the present stage? In Modgil, S., & Modgil, C. (Eds.) *Lawrence Kohlberg: Consensus and controversy* (pp. 107-121). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press, Taylor and Francis, Inc.
- Walker, L. J. (1989). A longitudinal moral reasoning. *Child Development*, 60, 157-166.
- Wilbur, R. (2000). The use of ASL to support the development of English and literacy. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 5, 81-104.

Appendix A

Appendix B: The Nine Hypothetical Dilemmas*

ASTERISKED QUESTIONS may be eliminated if time for interviewing is limited.

Moral Judgment Interview

Form A

Dilemma III: In Europe, a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that the doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging ten times what the drug cost him to make. He paid \$400 for the radium and charged \$4,000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money and tried every legal means, but he could only get together about \$2,000, which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying, and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, "No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it." So, having tried every legal means, Heinz gets desperate and considers breaking into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife.

1. Should Heinz steal the drug?

1a. Why or why not?

X *2. [The following question is designed to elicit the subject's moral type and should be considered optional.] Is it actually right or wrong for him to steal the drug?

X *2a. [The following question is designed to elicit the subject's moral type and should be considered optional.] Why is it right or wrong?

*The numbering of the dilemmas reflects their placement in the original research interview (Kohlberg, 1958). Since the numbers quickly became labels denoting the particular dilemmas, they were not changed when the forms were created rearranging their order.

APPENDIX B

641

3. Does Heinz have a duty or obligation to steal the drug?

3a. Why or why not?

4. If Heinz doesn't love his wife, should he steal the drug for her? (If subject favors not stealing ask: Does it make a difference in what Heinz should do whether or not he loves his wife?)

4a. Why or why not?

5. Suppose the person dying is not his wife but a stranger. Should Heinz steal the drug for the stranger?

5a. Why or why not?

*6. (If subject favors stealing the drug for a stranger) Suppose it's a pet animal he loves. Should Heinz steal to save the pet animal?

*6a. Why or why not?

7. Is it important for people to do everything they can to save another's life?

7a. Why or why not?

*8. It is against the law for Heinz to steal. Does that make it morally wrong?

*8a. Why or why not?

9. In general, should people try to do everything they can to obey the law?

9a. Why or why not?

9b. How does this apply to what Heinz should do?

*10. [The following question is designed to elicit the subject's orientation and should be considered optional.] In thinking back over the dilemma, what would you say is the most responsible thing for Heinz to do?

*10a. Why?

[Questions 1 and 2 of Dilemma III' are optional. If you do not choose to use them, read Dilemma III' and its continuation and begin with question 3.]

Dilemma III': Heinz did break into the store. He stole the drug and gave it to his wife. In the newspapers the next day there was an account of the robbery. Mr. Brown, a police officer who knew Heinz, read the account. He remembered seeing Heinz running away from the store and realized that it was Heinz who stole the drug. Mr. Brown wonders whether he should report that it was Heinz who stole the drug.

*1. Should Officer Brown report Heinz for stealing?

*1a. Why or why not?

- *2. Suppose Officer Brown were a close friend of Heinz, should he then report him?

- *2a. Why or why not?

Continuation: Officer Brown did report Heinz. Heinz was arrested and brought to court. A jury was selected. The jury's job is to find whether a person is innocent or guilty of committing a crime. The jury finds Heinz guilty. It is up to the judge to determine the sentence.

3. Should the judge give Heinz some sentence, or should he suspend the sentence and let Heinz go free?

- 3a. Why is that best?

4. Thinking in terms of society, should people who break the law be punished?

- 4a. Why or why not?

- 4b. How does this apply to how the judge should decide?

5. Heinz was doing what his conscience told him when he stole the drug. Should a lawbreaker be punished if he is acting out of conscience?

- 5a. Why or why not?

- *6. [*The following question is designed to elicit the subject's orientation and should be considered optional.*] Thinking back over the dilemma, what would you say is the most responsible thing for the judge to do?

- *6a. Why?

Questions 7–12 are designed to elicit the subject's theory of ethics and should be considered optional. They should not be scored for moral stage.

- *7. What does the word *conscience* mean to you, anyhow? If you were Heinz, how would your conscience enter into the decision?

- *8. Heinz has to make a moral decision. Should a moral decision be based on one's feelings, or on one's thinking and reasoning about right and wrong?

- *9. Is Heinz's problem a moral problem? Why or why not?

- *9a. In general, what makes something a moral problem or what does the word *morality* mean to you?

- *10. If Heinz is going to decide what to do by thinking about what's really right, there must be some answer, some right solution. Is there really some correct solution to moral prob-

lems like Heinz's, or when people disagree, is everybody's opinion equally right? Why?

- *11. How do you know when you've come up with a good moral decision? Is there a way of thinking or a method by which one can reach a good or adequate decision?

- *12. Most people believe that thinking and reasoning in science can lead to a correct answer. Is the same thing true in moral decisions or are they different?

Dilemma I: Joe is a fourteen-year-old boy who wanted to go to camp very much. His father promised him he could go if he saved up the money for it himself. So Joe worked hard at his paper route and saved up the forty dollars it cost to go to camp, and a little more besides. But just before camp was going to start, his father changed his mind. Some of his friends decided to go on a special fishing trip, and Joe's father was short of the money it would cost. So he told Joe to give him the money he had saved from the paper route. Joe didn't want to give up going to camp, so he thinks of refusing to give his father the money.

1. Should Joe refuse to give his father the money?

- 1a. Why or why not?

[Questions 2 and 3 are designed to elicit the subject's moral type and should be considered optional.]

- *2. Does the father have the right to tell Joe to give him the money?

- *2a. Why or why not?

- *3. Does giving the money have anything to do with being a good son?

- *3a. Why or why not?

- *4. Is the fact that Joe earned the money himself important in this situation?

- *4a. Why or why not?

5. The father promised Joe he could go to camp if he earned the money. Is the fact that the father promised the most important thing in the situation?

- 5a. Why or why not?

6. In general, why should a promise be kept?

7. Is it important to keep a promise to someone you don't know well and probably won't see again?

- 7a. Why or why not?
- 8. What do you think is the most important thing a father should be concerned about in his relationship to his son?
- 8a. Why is that the most important thing?
- 9. In general, what should be the authority of a father over his son?
- 9a. Why?
- 10. What do you think is the most important thing a son should be concerned about in his relationship to his father?
- 10a. Why is that the most important thing?
- *11. [*The following question is designed to elicit the subject's orientation and should be considered optional.*] In thinking back over the dilemma, what would you say is the most responsible thing for Joe to do in this situation?
- *11a. Why?

Form B

Dilemma IV: There was a woman who had very bad cancer, and there was no treatment known to medicine that would save her. Her doctor, Dr. Jefferson, knew that she had only about six months to live. She was in terrible pain, but she was so weak that a good dose of a painkiller like morphine would make her die sooner. She was delirious and almost crazy with pain, but in her calm periods she would ask Dr. Jefferson to give her enough morphine to kill her. She said she couldn't stand the pain and she was going to die in a few months anyway. Although he knows that mercy-killing is against the law, the doctor thinks about granting her request.

- 1. Should Dr. Jefferson give her the drug that would make her die?
- 1a. Why or why not?
- *2. [*The following question is designed to elicit the subject's moral type and should be considered optional.*] Is it actually right or wrong for him to give the woman the drug that would make her die?
- *2a. Why is it right or wrong?
- 3. Should the woman have the right to make the final decision?
- 3a. Why or why not?
- *4. The woman is married. Should her husband have anything to do with the decision?

- 4a. Why or why not?
- *5. [*The following question is designed to elicit the subject's moral type and should be considered optional.*] What should a good husband do in this situation?
- *5a. Why?
- 6. Is there any way a person has a duty or obligation to live when he or she does not want to, when the person wants to commit suicide?
- 6a. Why or why not?
- *7. [*The following question is designed to elicit the subject's moral type and should be considered optional.*] Does Dr. Jefferson have a duty or obligation to make the drug available to the woman?
- *7a. Why or why not?
- 8. When a pet animal is badly wounded and will die, it is killed to put it out of its pain. Does the same thing apply here?
- 8a. Why or why not?
- 9. It is against the law for the doctor to give the woman the drug. Does that make it morally wrong?
- 9a. Why or why not?
- 10. In general, should people try to do everything they can to obey the law?
- 10a. Why or why not?
- *10b. How does this apply to what Dr. Jefferson should do?
- *11. [*The following question is designed to elicit the subject's moral orientation and should be considered optional.*] In thinking back over the dilemma, what would you say is the most responsible thing for Dr. Jefferson to do?
- *11a. Why?

[*Question 1 of Dilemma IV¹ is optional. If you do not choose to use it, read Dilemma IV¹ and its continuation and begin with question 2.*]

Dilemma IV¹: Dr. Jefferson did perform the mercy-killing by giving the woman the drug. Passing by at the time was another doctor, Dr. Rogers, who knew the situation Dr. Jefferson was in. Dr. Rogers thought of trying to stop Dr. Jefferson but the drug was already administered. Dr. Rogers wonders whether he should report Dr. Jefferson.

- *1. Should Dr. Rogers report Dr. Jefferson?
- *1a. Why or why not?

Continuation: Dr. Rogers did report Dr. Jefferson. Dr. Jefferson is

brought to court and a jury is selected. The jury's job is to find whether a person is innocent or guilty of committing a crime. The jury finds Dr. Jefferson guilty. It is up to the judge to determine the sentence.

2. Should the judge give Dr. Jefferson some sentence, or should he suspend the sentence and let Dr. Jefferson go free?
- 2a. Why is that best?
3. Thinking in terms of society, should people who break the law be punished?
- 3a. Why or why not?
- 3b. How does this apply to how the judge should decide?
4. The jury finds Dr. Jefferson legally guilty of murder. Would it be wrong or right for the judge to give him the death sentence (a legally possible punishment)? Why?
5. Is it ever right to give the death sentence? Why or why not? What are the conditions under which the death sentence should be given, in your opinion? Why are these conditions important?
6. Dr. Jefferson was doing what his conscience told him when he gave the woman the drug. Should a lawbreaker be punished if he is acting out of conscience?
- 6a. Why or why not?
- *7. *[The following question is designed to elicit the subject's moral orientation and should be considered optional.]* Thinking back over the dilemma, what would you say is the most responsible thing for the judge to do?
- *7a. Why?

[Questions 8-13 are designed to elicit the subject's theory of ethics and should be considered optional. They should not be scored for moral stage.]

- *8. What does the word *conscience* mean to you, anyhow? If you were Dr. Jefferson, how would your conscience enter into the decision?
- *9. Dr. Jefferson has to make a moral decision. Should a moral decision be based on one's feelings or on one's thinking and reasoning about right and wrong?
- *10. Is Dr. Jefferson's problem a moral problem? Why or why not?

- *10a. In general, what makes something a moral problem, or what does the word *morality* mean to you?
- *11. If Dr. Jefferson is going to decide what to do by thinking about what's really right, there must be some answer, some right solution. Is there really some correct solution to moral problems like Dr. Jefferson's, or when people disagree is everybody's opinion equally right? Why?
- *12. How do you know when you've come up with a good moral decision? Is there a way of thinking or a method by which one can reach a good or adequate decision?
- *13. Most people believe that thinking and reasoning in science can lead to a correct answer. Is the same thing true in moral decisions, or are they different?

Dilemma II: Judy was a twelve-year-old girl. Her mother promised her that she could go to a special rock concert coming to their town if she saved up from babysitting and lunch money to buy a ticket to the concert. She managed to save up the fifteen dollars the ticket cost plus another five dollars. But then her mother changed her mind and told Judy that she had to spend the money on new clothes for school. Judy was disappointed and decided to go to the concert anyway. She bought a ticket and told her mother that she had only been able to save five dollars. That Saturday she went to the performance and told her mother that she was spending the day with a friend. A week passed without her mother finding out. Judy then told her older sister, Louise, that she had gone to the performance and had lied to her mother about it. Louise wonders whether to tell their mother what Judy did.

1. Should Louise, the older sister, tell their mother that Judy lied about the money or should she keep quiet?
- 1a. Why?
- *2. In wondering whether to tell, Louise thinks of the fact that Judy is her sister. Should that make a difference in Louise's decision?
- *2a. Why or why not?
- *3. *[The following question is designed to elicit the subject's moral type and should be considered optional.]* Does telling have anything to do with being a good daughter?
- *3a. Why or why not?

- *4. Is the fact that Judy earned the money herself important in this situation?
- *4a. Why or why not?
- 5. The mother promised Judy she could go to the concert if she earned the money. Is the fact that the mother promised the most important thing in the situation?
- 5a. Why or why not?
- 6. Why in general should a promise be kept?
- 7. Is it important to keep a promise to someone you don't know well and probably won't see again?
- 7a. Why or why not?
- 8. What do you think is the most important thing a mother should be concerned about in her relationship to her daughter?
- 8a. Why is that the most important thing?
- 9. In general, what should be the authority of a mother over her daughter?
- 9a. Why?
- 10. What do you think is the most important thing a daughter should be concerned about in her relationship to her mother?
- 10a. Why is that the most important thing?

[The following question is designed to elicit the subject's orientation and should be considered optional.]

- *11. In thinking back over the dilemma, what would you say is the most responsible thing for Louise to do in this situation?
- *11a. Why?

Form C

Dilemma V: In Korea, a company of Marines was way outnumbered and was retreating before the enemy. The company had crossed a bridge over a river, but the enemy were mostly still on the other side. If someone went back to the bridge and blew it up, with the head start the rest of the men in the company would have, they could probably then escape. But the man who stayed back to blow up the bridge would not be able to escape alive. The captain himself is the man who knows best how to lead the retreat. He asks for volunteers, but no one will volunteer. If he goes himself, the men will probably not get back safely and he is the only one who knows how to lead the retreat.

- 1. Should the captain order a man to go on the mission or should he go himself?
- 1a. Why?
- 2. Should the captain send a man (or even use a lottery) when it means sending him to his death?
- 2a. Why or why not?
- 3. Should the captain go himself when it means that the men will probably not make it back safely?
- 3a. Why or why not?
- 4. Does the captain have the right to order a man if he thinks it's best?
- 4a. Why or why not?
- 5. Does the man who is selected have a duty or obligation to go?
- 5a. Why or why not?
- 6. What's so important about human life that makes it important to save or protect?
- 6a. Why is that important?
- *6b. How does that apply to what the captain should do?
- *7. [The following question is designed to elicit the subject's orientation and should be considered optional.] In thinking back over the dilemma, what would you say is the most responsible thing for the captain to do?
- *7a. Why?

Dilemma VIII: In a country in Europe, a poor man named Valjean could find no work, nor could his sister and brother. Without money, he stole food and medicine that they needed. He was captured and sentenced to prison for six years. After a couple of years, he escaped from the prison and went to live in another part of the country under a new name. He saved money and slowly built up a big factory. He gave his workers the highest wages and used most of his profits to build a hospital for people who couldn't afford good medical care. Twenty years had passed when a tailor recognized the factory owner as being Valjean, the escaped convict whom the police had been looking for back in his hometown.

- 1. Should the tailor report Valjean to the police?
- 1. Why or why not?
- 2. Does a citizen have a duty or obligation to report an escaped convict?

- 2a. Why or why not?
- 3. Suppose Valjean were a close friend of the tailor. Should he then report Valjean?
- 3a. Why or why not?
- 4. If Valjean were reported and brought before the judge, should the judge send him back to jail or let him go free?
- 4a. Why?
- 5. Thinking in terms of society, should people who break the law be punished?
- 5a. Why or why not?
- 5b. How does this apply to what the judge should do?
- 6. Valjean was doing what his conscience told him to do when he stole the food and medicine. Should a lawbreaker be punished if he is acting out of conscience?
- 6a. Why or Why not?
- *7. *[The following question is designed to elicit the subject's orientation and should be considered optional.]* In thinking back over the dilemma, what would you say is the most responsible thing for the tailor to do?
- *7a. Why?

[Questions 8–13 are designed to elicit the subject's theory of ethics and should be considered optional. They should not be scored for moral stage.]

- *8. What does the word *conscience* mean to you, anyhow? If you were Valjean, how would your conscience enter into the decision?
- *9. Valjean has to make a moral decision. Should a moral decision be based on one's feelings or on one's thinking and reasoning about right and wrong?
- *10. Is Valjean's problem a moral problem? Why or why not?
- *10a. In general, what makes something a moral problem, or what does the word *morality* mean to you?
- *11. If Valjean is going to decide what to do by thinking about what's really right, there must be some answer, some right solution. Is there really some correct solution to moral problems like Valjean's, or when people disagree is everybody's opinion equally right? Why?
- *12. How do you know when you've come up with a good moral decision? Is there a way of thinking or a method by which one can reach a good or adequate decision?
- *13. Most people believe that thinking and reasoning in science

can lead to a correct answer. Is the same thing true in moral decisions, or are they different?

Dilemma VII: Two young men, brothers, had got into serious trouble. They were secretly leaving town in a hurry and needed money. Karl, the older one, broke into a store and stole a thousand dollars. Bob, the younger one, went to a retired old man who was known to help people in town. He told the man that he was very sick and that he needed a thousand dollars to pay for an operation. Bob asked the old man to lend him the money and promised that he would pay him back when he recovered. Really Bob wasn't sick at all, and he had no intention of paying the man back. Although the old man didn't know Bob very well, he lent him the money. So Bob and Karl skipped town, each with a thousand dollars.

- 1a. Which is worse, stealing like Karl or cheating like Bob?
- 1a. Why is that worse?
- 2. What do you think is the worst thing about cheating the old man?
- 2a. Why is that the worst thing?
- 3. In general, why should a promise be kept?
- 4. Is it important to keep a promise to someone you don't know well or will never see again?
- 4a. Why or why not?
- 5. Why shouldn't someone steal from a store?
- 6. What is the value or importance of property rights?
- 7. Should people do everything they can to obey the law?
- 7a. Why or why not?
- *8. *[The following question is designed to elicit the subject's orientation and should be considered optional.]* Was the old man being irresponsible by lending Bob the money?
- *8a. Why or why not?

Appendix B

Appendix B

The Nine Hypothetical Dilemmas: Moral Judgment Interview:

Translating written English (WE) version to American Sign Language (ASL) version:

THERE-*lf* EUROPE ONE TOWN 5:↓CL@*lf* WOMAN HAVE CANCER ^{Pursed lips} SOON
DIE

^t
THAT CANCER SELF→1:;-CL R-A-R-E

Rt-HER DOCTOR THINK HAVE DRUG HELP-HER-*rt* WILL

^q
UNDERSTAND DRUG-PERSON MONEY SPENT (2h)alt L:;-CL++‘MIX’ DRUG

^q
FOUND WHERE SAME TOWN 5:↓CL@*lf*

^{rhet.q} DRUG-PERSON SPENT WORTH WHAT 400 DECIDE SELL 4-THOUSAND ^{rhet.q} WHY

^{Puff cheeks}
FOUND DRUG DECIDE SELL EARN MONEY+

NOW 5:↓CL@*lf* INDEX-*lf* WOMAN HUSBAND NAME ^q WHAT #GEORGE HE-*rt*

^{Tight lips, head back slightly}
OIC (THAT)+++ ‘realize’1:;-CL→1:;-CL ‘approach’ ^t NEGOTIATE BORROW

^t
1:;-CL→1:;-CL ‘approach’ NEGOTIATE BORROW1:;-CL→1:;-CL ‘approach’

^t
NEGOTIATE BORROW-*arc*

^q
ALL-TOTAL TWO-THOUSAND NOT ENOUGH WHY NEED FOUR-THOUSAND

^{Cs} ^{pursue lips}
TIME SOON EXPIRE #GEORGE GO-AHEAD MET DRUG-PERSON KISSwg

_____Q
'negotiate-persuade' NOT-MIND 2:→CL 1:→CL *index first finger*- 'list' 'number one'

_____q
DISCOUNT 1:→CL *index second finger* BORROW PAY-BACK LATER _____q

_____neg
DRUGGIST *lf*-NO-rt PAY-ME FULL OR (2h)NONE DRUG

Exasperation _____teeth clench
AGAIN #GEORGE KISSwg-arc NEGOTIATE-PERSUADE FAIL+ #GEORGE

_____q
(2h)THINK QUESTION GO-AHEAD BREAK-IN DRUGGIST STORE STEAL DRUG

_____q
GIVE WIFE HOPE WIFE RECOVER

Purse lips _____q
1. CURIOUS #GEORGE SHOULD GO-AHEAD STEAL DRUG?

_____Wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?

2. SKIP

a. SKIP

Purse lips
3. CURIOUS #GEORGE HAVE DUTY OR RESPONSIBILITY MUST GO-
AHEAD STEAL DRUG?

_____wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?

_____neg _____wh.q
4. SUPPOSE #GEORGE NOT LOVE WIFE, CURIOUS #GEORGE SHOULD GO-
AHEAD

STEAL DRUG GIVE-HER RECOVER (cross fingers)?

_____q
(If subject says no) STEAL MATTER #IF LOVE OR NOT LOVE WIFE?

_____Wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?

5. $\frac{\text{cs}}{\text{wh.q}}$ YOU RECENT COMMENT, NOW SUPPOSE STRANGER SELF \rightarrow 1;-CL

wh.q q
'SELF' SOON DIE, #GEORGE SHOULD STILL GO-AHEAD STEAL DRUG

_____q
GIVE STRANGER?

a. $\frac{\text{wh.q}}{\text{WHY? WHY NOT?}}$

6. (If subject favors stealing the drug for a stranger) #IF #GEORGE HAVE

intense	th	neg
FAVORITE+++ P-E-T CRAZY HAPPEN HIT	(2h)2;-CL 'SICK' CAN'T SOLVE	

QUESTION SHOULD #GEORGE GO-AHEAD STEAL DRUG GIVE P-E-T?

a. $\frac{\text{wh.q}}{\text{WHY? WHY NOT?}}$

_____q_____head shaking

7. IMPORTANT MUST ALWAYS TRY SAVE PERSON LIFE NO-MATTER-WHAT?

_____ t pursued lips _____ q

8. STEAL ILLEGAL+, MEAN #MORALLY WRONG?

a. wh.q
WHY? WHY NOT?

9. YOUR → 1;₁-CL VIEW → 1;₁-CL, PEOPLE 5;₁-CL-*one circular motion* ALL-

AROUND' SHOULD FIRM FOLLOW+ LAW?

a. WHY? WHY NOT? wh.q

b. cs wh.q
RECENTLY YOU EXPLAIN *rt-APPLY-TO-lf* #GEORGE HOW?

Dilemma III continued

eyebrows furrow
WE-2 RECENT DISCUSSION NOW MOVE-ASIDE HOLD REMEMBER STAY-

eyebrows raise mouth shape: "miss"
THERE NOW ACTUAL #GEORGE BREAK-IN STORE STEAL

emphasis
DRUG GIVE WIFE FINISH.

OVERNIGHT SPREAD NEWSPAPER ARTICLE (L:↓-CL-move down on palm) MAN

eyebrows raise eyebrows raise
SELF → 1: CL (set left) NAME WHAT #MR. BROWN NEWSPAPER

eyebrows furrow Nodding
PUZZLE POLICEMAN OPEN- ARTICLE-READ (Nod several times) ME

gaze-rt mouthshape:pop Gaze-rt eyebrows
REMEMBER SPOT #GEORGE *rt-ZOOM-lf* (head shift right) LOOK STORE

Furrowed lips pursued Gaze-rt eyebrows raised
WHAT'S UP NOW ME SUSPECT+++. THINK-THINK SHOULD

pursued lips
GO-AHEAD REPORT #GEORGE STEAL DRUG.

Eyebrows raised eyebrows furrowed
1. NOW ME-ASK-YOU CURIOUS POINT (left hand index) POLICE

q q-pursed lips q
SHOULD GO-AHEAD REPORT?

Eyebrows raised
2. SUPPOOSE POINT (left hand index) POLICE *rt-BOTH-lf* #GEORGE

emphasis q
("r" backward) BEST-FRIEND STILL GO-AHEAD REPORT?

Wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?

Continuation:

Cs pursed lips eyebrows raised
RECENT WE DISCUSS MOVE-ASIDE HOLD REMEMBER CONNECT

Eyebrows furrowed eyebrows raised eyebrows furrowed mouthshape: LATER
APPLY WILL SUPPOSE ACTUAL POINT (left hand

"miss" Pursed lips
index) POLCIE GO-AHEAD REPORT #GEORGE, FINISH ARREST MUST GO

q
COURT. KNOW COURT HAVE #JURY YOU KNOW #JURY? (If NO (body shift to

right) 6 OR 12 PEOPLE BROUGHT-FROM-OUTSIDE COME SIT WATCH LISTEN

eyebrows furrowed eyebrows raised
COURT PROCESS FINISH GROUP-MOVE-TO-RIGHT ROOM DISCUSS

q
SHOULD INNOCENT OR GUILTY.)

DISCUSS FINISH (move to court (left side)) ANNOUNCE #GEORGE GUILTY.

Eyebrows raised
UNDERSTAND WHEN COURT FINISH, JUDGE DECIDE GIVE #SENTENCE

Q eyebrows furrowed eyebrows raised
MEAN WHAT HOW MUCH PUNISHMENT SHOULD GIVE CAN LESS

emphasis
#OR SEVERE LIKE WAIVE, JAIL FEW DAYS, FEW MONTHS FEW, YEARS #OR

15 30 YEARS DEPEND JUDGE DECISION.

Q
3. SHOULD JUDGE GIVE-If #GEORGE PRISON OR NONE?

a. Cs eyebrows raised wh.q
U RECENT COMMENT THAT FIT #GEORGE WHY?

_____pursued lips
4. #GEORGE 1:CL PUT-PERSON-ASIDE (left) SOCIETY THEIR-rt PERSPECTIVE

q
#IF SOMEONE BREAK LAW SHOULD PUNISH?

wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?

Q
b. JUDGE DECISION SHOULD (body shift to left) FOLLOW SOCIETY

Eyebrows raised
PERSPECTIVE #OR (body shift to right) FOLLOW INTUITION

Gaze-rt
HIS FEELINGS?

Pursed lip
5. BEFORE ME GO-AHEAD ASK-YOU QUESTION HAND-WAVE

Eyebrows raised
YOU KNOW WHAT #CONSCIENCE MEAN?

Eyebrows raised eyebrows furrowed
(yes-skip no-explain: #CONSCIENCE THAT-POINT-If FEELING INTUITION

eyebrows furrowed
OPINION (body shift to left) WHAT RIGHT (body shift to right) WHAT

WRONG.

Eyebrows raised
#GEORGE FOLLOW-If HIS-If #CONSCIENCE, NOW SUPPOSE PERSON

q
INDEX-rt BROKE LAW WHY FOLLOW #CONSCIENCE rt-SAME-If #GEORGE

q
(question mark X-CLwg) PERSON-rt SHOULD PUNISH?

Wh.q
a. WHY?

7. CURIOUS YOUR PERSPECTIVE #CONSCIENCE MEAN WHAT?

Eyebrows furrowed _____ eyebrows raised
SUPPOSE YOU (palm up point up and down body) SELF #GEORGE

Eyebrows raised wh.q
YOUR #CONSCIENCE INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION HOW?

8. AGAIN BEFORE ME Pursed lips Q GO-AHEAD ASK-YOU QUESTION

YOU KNOW WHAT #MORAL MEANS? (yes-skip, no-define it a little) #MORAL

_____Q_____eyebrows furrowed
DECISION SHOULD FOLLOW (body shifts slightly to left) FEELINGS INTUITION

#OR (body shifts slightly to right) THINKING WHICH? Wh.g

9. YOUR VIEW #GEORGE PROBLEM RELATE MORAL PROBLEM?

a. Eyebrows furrowed pursed lips eyebrows raised
#GEORGE PROBLEM MOVE-ASIDE-*lf* YOUR VIEW GENERAL

wh.q
CAN YOU EXPLAIN WHAT PROBLEM BELONG #MORAL PROBLEMS?

Wh.q
#MORALITY MEANS #TO YOU WHAT?

Dilemma I:

#JOE INDEX-If AGE 14 Eyebrows raised WANT GO CAMP

HIS-*lf* FATHER PROMISE-*lf* eyebrows raised WILL GO #IF INVEST MONEY WORTH WHAT _____q

Wh.q
40 DOLLARS FOR-FOR CAMP AND OTHER THINGS

mouthshape: "miss" emphasis
ACTUAL #JOE FREAK-OUT NEWSPAPER DELIVER-*arc*+++ FINISH

EARN.

Cs closed tight lips
#JOE FATHER *lf*-BOTHwg-*rt* READY LEAVE GO #BUT FATHER CHANGE-MIND

q
WHY FATHER FRIENDS DECIDE GO FISH.

Q eyebrows raised
UNDERSTAND FATHER MONEY WANT BORROW MONEY FROM #JOE

Eyebrows raised q
#JOE THAT-*lf* WANT GO-DEPART CAMP WHY EARN 40 DOLLARS

wh.q
FOR-FOR

Eyebrows raised gaze down neg
NOW #JOE THINK WON'T GIVE MONEY.

Eyebrows raised q neg
1. NOW ME ASK-YOU #OK #JOE REFUSE GIVE-*rt* MONEY FATHER?

Wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?

Eyebrows raised cs
4. THAT SITUATION JUST COMMENT #JOE EARN 40 DOLLARS SELF→1;-CL

q
'HIMSELF' IMPORTANT?

Wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?

Q
5.REMEMBER THAT FATHER FINISH PROMISE #JOE GO CAMP WILL #IF

_____q
#JOE EARN 40 DOLLARS NOW FATHER PROMISE (point) MOST IMPORTANT?

_____Wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?

_____Eyebrows raised _____pursed lips wh.q
6. YOUR OPINION PROMISE SHOULD GO-AHEAD WHY?

_____Q _____neg
7. SUPPOSE PERSON INDEX-If YOU DON'T-KNOW WHO (point left)

_____neg _____q
KNOW WILL NOT SEE AGAIN YOU-BOTH-If PROMISE IMPORTANT?

_____Wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?

_____Wh.q
8. FATHER SON If-BOTH-rt++ RELATIONSHIP CURIOUS FATHER MOST

_____wh.q
CONCERN SHOULD WHAT?

_____Cs _____wh.q
a. YOU JUST COMMENT WHY THAT MOST IMPORTANT?

_____Eyebrows raised _____eyebrows furrowed
9. YOUR OPINION FATHER CONTROL SON HOW MUCH?

_____Wh.q
a. WHY?

_____Wh.q
10. FATHER SON If-BOTH-rt++ RELATIONSHIP CURIOUS SON MOST CONCERN

_____wh.q
SHOULD WHAT?

Eyebrows raised _____ cs _____ wh.q
a. YOU JUST COMMENT WHY THAT MOST IMPORTANT?

Dilemma IV:

_____ Emphasis _____ q
WOMAN INDEX-*lf* BAD #CANCER HAVE WOMAN DOCTOR NAME WHAT

#DR. JEFFERSON *lf*-BOTH-*rt*++ FINISH TASTE #ALL-*arc* MEDICINE FAIL

lf-BOTH-*rt*++ KNOW WOMAN 6 MONTHS LIFE LEFT

_____ eyebrows furrowed emphasis
WOMAN SUFFER SEVERE

_____ Emphasis eyebrows raised
WOMAN WEAK SUPPOSE GIVE LITTLE MEDICINE LIKE #MORPHINE

#KILL WILL FOR-SURE NO QUESTION

_____ blow wh.q _____ emphasis
WOMAN MIND 5:↑-CL'NONE' WHY TOO-MUCH PAIN

_____ q
SOMETIMES WOMAN RELAX TEND ASK DOCTOR GIVE-ME #MORPHINE

_____ Q _____ emphasis
WHY OVER DEFINITELY

_____ Wh.q _____ emphasis
SHE SAID THAT WHY PAIN CAN'T-STAND ANYWAY WILL DIE SOON

_____ t
#MERCY KILLING #DR. JEFFERSON INDEX-*rt* KNOW FORBID NOW THINK

_____ pursed lips
GO-AHEAD

- _____ q
1. #DR. JEFFERSON HAVE DRUG SHOULD GIVE THAT WOMAN POP-IN

_____q
MOUTH DIE WILL?

a. $\frac{\text{Wh.q}}{\text{WHY? WHY NOT?}}$

2. SKIP

3. eyebrows raised
3. YOUR PERSPECTIVE THAT WOMAN (2h) 1:_i-CL ← 1:_i-CL “ALONE’ FINAL

DECISION 1: t -CL \leftarrow SELF 'HERSELF' SHOULD? $\frac{q}{}$

a. $\frac{\text{wh.q}}{\text{WHY? WHY NOT?}}$

4. eyebrows raised NOW THAT WOMAN HAVE HUSBAND,

q

CURIOUS HUSBAND INVOLVE FINAL DECISION SHOULD?

a. wh.q
WHY? WHY NOT?

5. SKIP

6. #WHEN THAT PERSON SUICIDE eyebrows raised eyebrows raised
WANT MEAN LIVE CONTINUE

_____neg _____q _____q
DON'T-WANT CURIOUS THAT PERSON DUTY LIVE MUST?

a. wh.q
WHY? WHY NOT?

7. SKIP

eyebrows raised emphasis neg
8. SUPPOSE #PET BAD INJURED DON'T-KNOW HOW ANYWAY SOON

wh.q eyebrows furrowed
DIE COMMON TEND INJECT DIE FOR-FOR ELIMINATE PAIN NOW CURIOUS

q
THAT #PET PROCEDURE APPLY WOMAN SHOULD?

wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?

eyebrows raised
9. YOU-KNOW-THAT COMMON LAW FORBID DOCTOR GIVE THAT

q
WOMAN DRUG POP-IN-MOUTH DIE THAT #MORALLY WRONG?

wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?

eyebrows raised q
10. YOUR VIEW PEOPLE 5:~CL-circular motion ALL-AROUND SHOULD

Eyebrows furrowed tight lips
FIRM FOLLOW LAW?

wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?

cs wh.q
b. RECENTLY YOU EXPLAIN *rt-APPLY-lf* #DR. JEFFERSON HOW?

Dilemma IV continued...

pursed lips
#DR JEFFERSON WOMAN CANCER *lf-BOTH-rt* GO-AHEAD INJECT-*lf*

th
HIT (body shifts to right) OTHER DOCTOR 1:~CL ← SELF 'HIMSELF' #DR ROGERS

eyebrows raised body leans forward slightly back leans
KNOW THAT SITUATION, SPOT ENTER PLAN INTERVENE BACK-

backward slightly wh.q emphasis gaze-down q
OFF WHY DRUG IN WOMAN FINISH THINK SHOULD REPORT

q
#DR. JEFFERSON?

1. q CURIOUS #DR. ROGERS REPORT #DR. JEFFERSON q SHOULD?

Continuation:

cs lips pursed
RECENT WE-2 DISCUSS PUT-ASIDE , HOLD, REMEMBER, CONNECT LATER

rhet.q lips pursed
APPLY WILL, SUPPOSE INDEX-rt GO-AHEAD REPORT #DR. JEFFERSON

FINISH ARREST MUST GO COURT KNOW COURT HAVE #JURY

q
(expand by asking: YOU KNOW JURY?) (body shift to right) 6 OR 12 PEOPLE

lips pursed
BROUGHT-FROM-OUTSIDE COME SIT WATCH LISTEN COURT PROCESS

q
FINISH GROUP-MOVE-TO-RIGHT ROOM DISCUSS SHOULD INNOCENT OR

GUILTY

DISCUSS FINISH (move to court (left side)) ANNOUNCE #DR JEFFERSON GUILTY

q
UNDERSTAND COURT FINISH, JUDGE DECIDE GIVE #SENTENCE

q eyebrows raised
MEAN WHAT HOW MUCH PUNISHMENT SHOULD GIVE CAN LESS

#OR SEVERE LIKE WAIVE, JAIL FEW DAYS, FEW MONTHS, FEW YEARS #OR

15, 30 YEARS DEPEND JUDGE DECISION

_____q
2. SHOULD JUDGE GIVE #DR. JEFFERSON PRISON OR NONE?

_____cs _____wh.q
a. YOU RECENT COMMENT THAT FIT #DR JEFFERSON WHY?

_____t
3.#DR. JEFFERSON PUT-1:T-CL-ASIDE-*lf* SOCIETY THEIR-*rt*

_____t _____q
PERSPECTIVE #IF SOMEONE BREAK LAW, SHOULD PUNISH?

_____wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?

_____q
b. JUDGE DECISION SHOULD FOLLOW (body shifts to right

_____gaze-*rt*
slightly) SOCIETY PERSPECTIVE #OR (body shifts to left slightly)

_____gaze-*lf* _____wh.q
FOLLOW INTUITION HIS FEELINGS WHICH?

4.YOU FINISH KNOW #JURY DECIDE #DR. JEFFERSON GUILTY

eyebrows furrowed
NOW CURIOUS JUDGE GIVE #DR. JEFFERSON DEATH #SENTENCE (body

_____wh.q
shifts slightly to the left) RIGHT (body shifts slightly to the right) WRONG WHICH?

_____eyebrows furrowed _____wh.q
5. CURIOUS YOUR OPINION DEATH #SENTENCE #WHEN ALL-RIGHT GIVE?

_____wh.q
WHY THAT OK?

6. BEFORE ME ASK-YOU QUESTION, YOU KNOW WHAT #CONSCIENCE

MEAN?

(YES-skip NO-define: #CONSCIENCE THAT-POINT FEELING, INTUITION

OPINION (body shifts slightly to left)WHAT RIGHT (body shift slightly to right) WHAT

WRONG

#DR JEFFERSON FOLLOW HIS #CONSCIENCE NOW eyebrows furrowed eyebrows raised
SUPPOSE

rhet.q
PERSON INDEX-*rt* BROKE LAW WHY FOLLOW #CONSCIENCE SAME-#DR

q
JEFFERSON X-CLwg 'question' PERSON INDEX-*rt* SHOULD PUNISH?

Dilemma II

#BOB HIS OLD BROTHER #DAVID *lf*-BOTH-*rt* RECENT INVOLVE TURMOIL Pursued lips

RELATE LAW *lf*-BOTH-*rt* MUST ESCAPE TOWN eyebrows raised #BUT NEED MONEY

FIRST

nod
lf-BOTH-*rt* DISCUSS AGREE NEED TWO-THOUSAND TOTAL UNDERSTAND

#DAVID STORE (body shifts to left) BROKE-IN STOLE ONE-THOUSAND

DOLLARS

#BOB (body shifts to right) MET RETIRED MAN 1:CL←SELF ^{emphasis} SWEET TEND

HELP++STRANGER #OR KNOW DOESN'T-MATTER #BOB ^{headshaking} NEGOTIATE ^{eyebrows raised}

^{Eyebrows furrowed} FOR-FOR ^{eyebrows raised} OPERATION #BUT REALLY MAKE-UP th

^{eyebrows raised} MEAN MONEY PAY-BACK WON'T ^{neg} *lf-BOTH-rt (2h) 1:CL-towards each other* 'MET'

FLEE FINISH

^{eyebrows raised} 1. SUPPOSE 5:↑CL-up and down 'YOU' GOD YOU DECIDE WHO WORSE ^{wh.q}

^{eyebrows raised} 2:→CL 'LIST' 1:←CL #DAVID STORE BROKE-IN STOLE ONE-THOUSAND

^{eyebrows raised} 2:→CL 'LIST' 1:←CL #BOB MET RETIRED MAN BORROW

^{eyebrows raised} REALLY ^{eyebrows furrowed} FOOL FOR-FOR OPERATION WORTH ONE-THOUSAND

^{eyebrows raised} DOLLARS UNDERSTAND MONEY PAY-BACK WON'T WHICH WORSE? ^{neg} ^{wh.q}

a. ^{wh.q} WHY THAT WORST?

^t 2. FOOL RETIRED MAN, THAT WHAT AWFUL? ^{wh.q}

a. ^{cs} YOU RECENT COMMENT WHY THAT SEVERE? ^{wh.q}

^{eyebrows furrowed} 3.CURIOUS GENERAL PROMISE ^{eyebrows raised} ^{pursed lips} GO-AHEAD WHY? ^{wh.q}

eyebrows raised neg
4. .SUPPOSE PERSON INDEX-*lf* YOU DON'T-KNOW WHO INDEX-*lf* KNOW

neg q
NEVER SEE AGAIN YOU-BOTH-*lf* PROMISE IMPORTANT?

wh.q
b. WHY? WHY NOT?

neg wh.q
5. WHY SHOULD NOT STEAL FROM STORE?

t wh.q
6. PROPERTY RIGHTS IMPORTANT #OR VALUE WHAT?

q
7. PEOPLE ALWAYS MUST FOLLOW LAW?

wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?

Dilemma II

emphasis
#JUDY INDEX-*lf* 1;-CL←SELF AGE 12 HEARD FAVORITE GUITAR COME

emphasis
TOWN REALLY WANT+++ GO, ASK MOM

eyebrows raised rhet.q
MOM SAY FINE UNDERSTAND MUST INVEST WHY PAY SELF GO

pursed lips pursed lips
INDEX-*lf* GO-AHEAD INVEST TOTAL 20 DOLLARS MOVE-TRANSFER-*rt*

FIFTEEN FOR TICKET MOVE-TRANSFER-*lf* FIVE FOR SPEND

eyebrows raised tight lips eyebrows raised
READY INFORM MOM #BUT MOM CHANGED-MIND TOLD BUY NEW

CLOTHES FOR SCHOOL MUST

INDEX-*lf* OF COURSE gaze down DOWN GO-AHEAD OVERLOOK BUY TICKET INFORM

MOM UNTIL-NOW pursed lips INVEST TOTAL MONEY 5-DOLLAR

THAT DAY GUITAR EVENT (set right) INFORM MOM GO-*lf* FRIEND

eyebrows raised
REALLY SNEAK-*slight right under*

(2h) 5:↓-CL(WEAVE)+++ FINISH #BACK HOME

eyebrows raised neg th
NOW ONE-WEEK MOTHER STILL CLUELESS HIT INDEX-*lf* INFORM OLDER

Th eyebrows raised
SISTER #LOUISE INFORM I COVER-UP MOM I GO FRIEND REALLY

I SNEAK GUITAR

eyebrows raised gaze down
NOW #LOUISE THINK SHOULD TATTLE MOTHER

eyebrows furrowed eyebrows raised
1.NOW I ASK-YOU CURIOUS #LOUISE GO-AHEAD TATTLE MOTHER

JUDY FOOL MONEY OR SHH?

wh.q
a. WHY?

2. REMEMBER #LOUISE THINK SHOULD TATTLE MOM

eyebrows furrowed eyebrows raised
CURIOUS BOTH SISTER INFLUENCE DECISION?

a. wh.q
WHY? WHY NOT?

3.SKIP

4. REMEMBER #JUDY GO-AHEAD WHY RELATE INVEST MONEY?

a. WHY? WHY NOT? wh.q

5. REMEMBER MOTHER PROMISE CAN GO UNDERSTAND #IF INVEST eyebrows raised

eyebrows furrowed q
MONEY CURIOUS MOTHER PROMISE INFLUENCE #JUDY GO-
q
AHEAD?

a. $\frac{\text{wh.q}}{\text{WHY? WHY NOT?}}$

6. NOW eyebrows raised eyebrows raised STORY PUT-ASIDE YOUR PERSPECTIVE PROMISE

SHOULD GO-AHEAD WHY?

7. eyebrows raised PERSON 1: CL←SELF STRANGE SEE AGAIN DOUBT neg

eyebrows furrowed _____ q
CURIOUS YOU PROMISE 1;-CL←SELF KEEP SHOULD?

a. ^{wh.q}
WHY? WHY NOT?

8. eyebrows raised NOW YOUR PERSPECTIVE MOTHER IMPORTANT CONCERN RELATE

wh.q
DAUGHTER WHAT?

a. (recent comment) wh.q
WHY THAT IMPORTANT?

eyebrows raised wh.q
9. YOUR OPINION MOTHER CONTROL DAUGHTER HOW MUCH?

a. wh.q
WHY?

eyebrows raised
10. NOW YOUR PERSPECPTIVE DAUGHTER IMPORTANT CONCERN

wh.q
RELATE MOM WHAT?

a. (recent comment) wh.q
WHY THAT IMPORTANT?

Dilemma V

th th
KOREA WAR HIT ONE AREA GROUP MARINES BATTLE ACCIDENT GROUP-

cs
SHRINK ANYTIME ENEMY WILL BLIZZ GROUP, DO-DO GO-AHEAD

gaze-lf
rt-ESCAPE-*lf* OVER BRIDGE ENEMY COME-UP-TO BRIDGE (body shifts to

left) GROUP-*lf* (body shifts to right)GROUP-*rt*

eyebrows raised
GROUP-*lf* WANT EXPLODE BRIDGE WANT UNDERSTAND PROBLEM

rhet.q neg
WHAT #IF SOMEONE RUN EXPLODE BRIDGE ESCAPE ALIVE WON'T.

eyebrows raised nod
ANOTHER INDEX-*arc* GROUP NOT GO BRIDGE ESCAPE ALIVE CAN

GROUP CAPTAIN KNOW HOW ESCAPE (2h)ASK+++*-arc* VOLUNTEERS

WHO WILLING RUN BRIDGE EXPLODE #BUT Eyebrows raised neg
NO ONE RAISED-

neg
HAND NOTHING #IF CAPTAIN RUN BRIDGE EXPLODE DIE

neg rhet.q
GROUP ESCAPE ALIVE IMPOSSIBLE WHY CAPTAIN ONLY-PERSON KNOW

HOW ESCAPE, WHAT DO-DO STUCK.

Eyebrows furrowed eyebrows raised
1. I ASK CURIOUS CAPTAIN SHOULD COMMAND MAN RUN EXPLODE

BRIDGE #OR CAPTAIN 1:-CL←SELF RUN EXPLODE 1:-CL←SELF?

wh.q
a. WHY?

eyebrows furrowed q
2. CURIOUS ALL RIGHT CAPTAIN COMMAND MAN GO EXPLODE

neg
KNOW MAN BACK ALIVE NOT?

wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?

eyebrows furrowed
3. SUPPOSE CAPTAIN DECIDE GO EXPLODE BRIDGE DIE

eyebrows raised nod neg q
UNDERSTAND CAPTAIN KNOW GROUP-*lf* ESCAPE DOUBT ALL RIGHT?

wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?

eyebrows furrowed eyebrows raised nodding
4. CURIOUS YOUR PERSPECTIVE CAPTAIN KNOW FEEL INTUITION

q
HAVE RIGHT COMMAND MAN GO EXPLODE BRIDGE?

wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?

eyebrows raised
5. SUPPOSE MAN GROUP CAPTAIN PICK COMMAND GO EXPLODE

eyebrows furrowed q
BRIDGE CURIOUS MAN INDEX-*lf* HAVE DUTY #OR OBLIGATION GO

EXPLODE BRIDGE?

wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?

wh.q
8. SAVE #OR PROTECT HUMAN LIFE IMPORTANT WHAT?

wh.q
a. THAT IMPORTANT WHY?

cs wh.q
b. YOU JUST EXPLAIN APPLY CAPTAIN DO HOW?

Dilemma VIII

neg
COUNTRY DOWN-THERE EUROPE MAN NAME #STEVE POOR (2h)NONE #JOB

neg rhet.q th
SAME SISTER BROTHER HOW SURVIVE STEAL+++ FOOD MEDICINE WRONG

CAPTURED PRISON FOR 6 YEARS, AROUND TWO YEARS #STEVE ESCAPE

DOWN UNDER OTHER COUNTRY NAME CHANGE INVEST MONEY INVEST

SET FACTORY SMALL INCREASE-IN-SIZE WORKERS THEY
pursed lips

EARN MONEY GOOD MONEY, EARN PROFIT INVEST BUILD HOSPITAL FOR

PEOPLE CAN'T AFFORD, CAN GO-lfFREE
neg nod

THAT TIME PROCESS HIT 20 YEARS LATER MAN TAILOR SPOT POINT-rt
Pursed lips th

#STEVE REMEMBER HE ESCAPE PRISON, POLICE STILL LOOK POINT-rt
nodding

1. NOW I ASK YOU TAILOR GO-AHEAD REPORT POLICE SHOULD?
eyebrows raised q

a. WHY? WHY NOT?
wh.q

2. YOUR PERSPECTIVE PERSON 1:-CL←SELF #CITIZEN HAVE DUTY SPOT
eyebrows raised eyebrows raised

PERSON ESCAPE PRISON SHOULD REPORT POLICE?
q

a. WHY? WHY NOT?
wh.q

3. TAILOR #STEVE BEST-FRIEND, TAILOR GO-AHEAD REPORT?
q

a. WHY? WHY NOT?
wh.q

4.SUPPOSE Eyebrows raised #STEVE CAPTURE GO JUDGE, JUDGE RUB-CHIN GO-

AWAY JAIL OR WAIVE WHICH? ^{wh.q}

a. ^{wh.q} WHY?

5. #STEVE PUT-PERSON-ASIDE-*lf* SOCIETY THEIR-*rt* PERSPECTIVE #IF

SOMEONE BREAK LAW SHOULD PUNISH? ^q

a. ^{wh.q} WHY? WHY NOT?

c. JUDGE DECISION SHOULD ^{Eyebrows raised} (body shifts to right) FOLLOW

SOCIETY PERSPECTIVE #OR (body shifts to left) FOLLOW INTUITION

HIS FEELINGS WHICH? ^{wh.q}

4. BEFORE ME ASK YOU QUESTION YOU KNOW WHAT #CONSCIENCE ^q

MEAN?

(yes- skip no-explain: #CONSCIENCE THAT-POINT FEELING INTUITION

OPINION WHAT RIGHT WHAT WRONG.

#STEVE FOLLOW HIS #CONSCIENCE NOW ^{eyebrows furrowed} ^{eyebrows raised} SUPPOSE

PERSON INDEX-*rt* BROKE LAW WHY FOLLOW #CONSCIENCE SAME-#STEVE ^{rhet.q}

X-CLWg PERSON INDEX-*rt* SHOULD PUNISH? ^q

wh.q
a. WHY? WHY NOT?